

The Colorado, Mother of an Inland Empire Continued from page 2

Colorado at Laguna Dam a few miles above the town of Yuma was planned. This dam, which is the only dam at present installed on the Colorado, was put in to divert water to irrigate what is known as the Yuma project, an irrigation project sponsored by the United States Reclamation Service. The dam, which cost more than \$1,000,000, is what is known as a mat or basket dam, being simply set in the river to back up the water so as to get the necessary fall to irrigate the lands on the Arizona side.

By raising this dam a few feet higher, engineers have estimated, water could be diverted into a canal to be dug through the chain of sand hills that separates the river from Imperial Valley. This proposed canal would parallel the international line until it reaches the present canal at or near the place where it crosses the border and comes into American territory. Besides supplying all the present lands now under irrigation, this proposed canal could, through the use of pumping plants to force the water to higher levels, bring under irrigation about

240,000 more acres of land in this region.

To construct such a canal it would be necessary to make a deep cut or tunnel through the sand hills. Competent engineers say this is entirely feasible.

Mark Rose, an Imperial Valley farmer, of indomitable will, has worked for years on this plan, sometimes standing almost alone. Single-handed he tackled Washington and after years of patient endeavor succeeded in getting a contract from Franklin K. Lane, then Secretary of the Interior.

He organized a company known as the Imperial Laguna Water Company. After he had expended \$72,000 of his own and his associates' money in surveys and other preliminary work, the contract was canceled by Lane's successor, Secretary Payne, on the ground that Rose had not complied with its conditions by beginning the work in time.

Rose's failure, it is asserted, was largely due to the alleged political machinations of interests below the border, which naturally did not wish to

see an all-American canal built, as that would compel them to spend their own money to irrigate their lands.

Through the interposition of former Secretary Lane, an agreement was made at the time of the cancellation that Rose and his company were to be reimbursed for the money expended. The district, however, was enjoined from carrying out this agreement. Rose fought the case in the courts and lost out.

It had been Lane's plan for the government to give the 240,000 acres to be reclaimed by the all-American canal to returned soldiers, veterans of the World War, and the aid of the American Legion had been enlisted for this purpose.

Under Rose's contract with the government, he had agreed to build the canal at cost solely to develop the valley. His only pecuniary interest was in his desert claims that would be irrigated by the proposed canal.

A second and concluding installment of this article will appear in an early issue.

Must We Have a Federal Anti-Lynching Law?

By E. E. MILLER

SINCE Mr. Harding, in his first presidential address to Congress, invited the attention of that body, and of the nation, to the lynching evil, the public mind has not been allowed to forget the problem of racial relationships, or the problem of mob violence. The two problems are distinct, but in the South they are closely related.

The first reaction to the President's speech in the South was a vigorous protest by numerous political leaders and newspapers against the implication that a Federal law against lynching might be found necessary.

Lynchings, it was said in substance, are violations of state law and should be proceeded against by the state the same as other riots or other murders. Federal interference in such matters, it was pointed out, would be a direct interference with the police powers of the states, a possibly unconstitutional exercise of power by the national government to the disregard of state rights hitherto reserved and jealously guarded.

This argument is sound. It is, under our form of government, the legal and moral right of every state to punish its own criminals. Federal interference with this right would be risky, and should be unnecessary. A Federal law against lynching, Federal interference in the capture and prosecution of persons accused of lynching, would be bad for us in more than one way. It would be bad because it would lead the national government into the exercise of police powers yet reserved to the states, because it would take away from the state and the local community the right to administer their own affairs, and because it would almost certainly lead to a weakening of the fiber of local law and to a loss of self-confidence and self-reliance on the part of the communities affected by its application.

There remains, however, a higher, more sacred right than the right of the state to the exclusive exercise of the police powers within its bounds. That is the right of the individual citizen to have the benefit of the guaranties and the protection the law is supposed to give him. If the state fails to protect its citizens in their constitutional rights, the nation must sooner or later take that protection upon itself. I write as a southerner, from a southern viewpoint, and with the southerner's traditional—and I think justifiable—desire to see each state left as nearly free as prudence permits to deal with its own particular problems. It is as a southerner that I say that lynchings, and such race riots as grow directly out of lynchings, or attempted lynchings, are not going to be tolerated much longer by the conscience of this country or of the world, and that if the states do not stop lynchings the nation will and should do it.

The mob spirit is the enemy of all law. No state that permits mobs to work their will unchecked and then to go unpunished can reasonably expect obedience to law or respect for the agencies of the law. The South has been criminally negligent in this respect, and has paid the penalty, not only in unnecessary feeling and friction between the two races, but in its excessively large number of crimes against property and person. The Tulsa race riots were directly due to the failure of officials and citizens vigorously to uphold the law. The recent tarring and feathering of white women in Texas is but an example of the lengths to which the mob spirit will go when mob crimes are left unpunished.

Mob violence is not confined to the South; nor are all lynchings due to race feeling. White men are lynched. The mob spirit, even the unreasoning race feeling that leads to mob violence and lynching, exists in the North as well as in the South. No section of the country can claim immunity from race prejudice or from an active disrespect for the law. It is in the South, however, where the two races are the most closely thrown together, where the race consciousness is most exaggerated, and where lynchings seem to be most immune from punishment, that the worst record is made.

Last year 61 persons were killed by mobs in the United States. Fifty-two of these lynchings took place in the South. Fifty-three of the persons lynched were Negroes. Ten of the lynchings took place in Texas; nine in Georgia. Several attempts at lynching were

put down by officers of the law. Not a single person in a southern state, so far as I have been able to learn, has been punished for taking part in a lynching. In a majority of cases no real effort was made to find out the guilty parties and punish them.

Lynchings can be prevented—not every lynching, perhaps; but certainly a great majority of them. Most of them take place simply because the officials charged with the enforcement of the law do not try to prevent them. In Tennessee, with a governor who held that he could do nothing in case of a threatened lynching until requested by the local authorities, at least two mobs pursued Negroes for two or three days before catching them, the newspapers telling day by day of what was going on, and finally reporting the burning of both victims by mobs maddened by hate and lust for blood. I saw one of these mobs with its victim; rode on the same train with it for several miles and knew that a dozen resolute men backed by the authority of the state could have prevented the brutal and brutalizing end. The succeeding governor announced that he would use all his power to prevent lynchings, and did use force against mobs. There was not a single lynching during his two years in office. A few years ago a white person accused of a sensational crime was taken from the Georgia penitentiary and hanged by a mob. The very next morning the governor of the state came out with a statement that he had no idea that the guilty parties would ever be found. Newspapers all over the South published detailed reports of the affair purporting to come from members of the mob, but no effort was made to find out who they were, or to bring them to justice. Since then Georgia has had more lynchings than any other state.

Mis-Picturing Us Abroad Continued from page 6

eness. Such scenes shown to an illiterate Indian audience can have no other effect than to lower the prestige of the white woman and the white race in general. The board has accordingly been compelled to be somewhat strict on that point.

"It must be remembered that in 99 per cent of films shown in India the characters are all white people, the white hero and heroine and the white evil woman and the white villain. This is obviously unfortunate for India, but quite ineradicable. In most films the evil woman and the villain are shown carrying on successfully through a major portion of the film. This does not tend to uplift the prestige of the British race in India, while at the same time it is questionable whether the discomfiture of evil in the last few minutes is sufficient, so far as the half educated native is concerned, to teach the good moral which is sought to be taught."

Very diplomatic, indeed! The board's criticism of American films is based on the assumption that the carrying of moral propaganda by them is intended. Those who have seen "Her Price" and "The Scarlet Letter," both Fox films, or "In Again, Out Again," an Artcraft picture, may judge as to the correctness of that assumption. The writer has seen no one of the three. They are all listed among the films excluded by the Bengal board.

The war made the American motion picture dominant throughout the world. The government has looked with much favor on the development of big export trade in pictures, not so much because of its intrinsic return—at the highest the business has amounted to only about \$8,000,000 a year—but because of the incidental advertising of America thus afforded. It is now awakening to the fact that much of that advertising is of a misleading and even a damaging kind.

"I would not think of living in your country," declared a cultured Oriental to an American traveler. "It is too cold; I would freeze!"

Lynchings can be prevented. They occur, in most part, simply because state and local officials do not try to prevent them, because public sentiment to a certain extent condones them.

The people of the South have it in their power to prevent the enactment of a Federal anti-lynching law. They have it in their power to remove from the reputation of the South the stain mob violence and public indifference to the Negro's legal rights have made upon it. They have it in their power to lessen to a great degree the present intense bitterness between the races and to make possible a rational co-operation of white and black in the upbuilding of their common country. But before they can do this they must frankly face the facts as they are. They must cease trying to exculpate themselves and to shift all blame for the present unhappy state of things on the Negro. They must be honest with themselves, as some of them have not been. They must cease to listen to leaders who will not face the fact, or who try to appeal to prejudice rather than to justice.

The day after President Harding read his message, Senator Heflin, of Alabama, said in almost so many words that there is but one way to stop lynchings and that is to stop the crime that causes them. "The crime" implied, of course, is the assault of white women by Negroes. Of the 53 Negroes lynched last year, crimes against women were charged against 21. It is the too general southern tendency to let itself be fooled by sophistries and insinuations, rather than any general desire to deal unfairly with the black man, that has made the South's record of lynchings a thing of personal shame to every manly and patriotic southerner.

It will be well for the country if lynchings can be stopped without a Federal anti-lynching law. They should be so stopped, and can be. The time is at hand, however, when lynchings are going to be stopped. If the states do not stop them the nation will.

"We have all the climates and few extremes," the American replied.

"You cannot deceive me," the Oriental responded. "Where you have to daub the walls of your houses to keep out the cold no civilized being would live."

His conception of American houses was in terms of the adobe hut of the Southwest, which type alone he had seen in our cowboy movies.

Aside from the misinformation conveyed, and even aside from the positively nauseous films made for export trade alone, the worst damage done us by the run of American films shown abroad is perhaps in the impression they give of the crudity of our manners, the shallowness of our thought, our seeming absolute lack of artistic sense.

There is on file in the State Department a translation of an article appearing on May 15, 1921, in *El Dia*, a newspaper published at Montevideo, Uruguay. It is headed, "Yankee Cinematography." Only a part of it can be quoted here.

"Cowboys, bands of thieves, secret societies, detectives, beggars, who hide prodigious inventions . . . Poor imagination. Absolute lack of sensibility . . . With what spirit do the authors and the manufacturers of Yankee films observe life? It may be said that they have a purely mechanical concept of the world, the soul, of love and life. The ideology which inspires all of their cinematography is primitive and puerile. I do not know anything less transcendent, at this time when everything assumes a transcendental character, than the American film. It never makes us think, it never makes us dream . . . It is an art (How it hurts to use this word!) which has only been able to be gigantically developed amid inferior people."

If to a man of culture, as the writer of the above evidently is, our film abroad carries the conviction that we must be an "inferior people," what must be the effect on the minds of the illiterate colored races, ever watching for something to back up their low estimate of white men in general and the Yankee in particular!